

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, and 25-27 are independent claims. Claims 26 and 27 have been withdrawn by the Office, and are being canceled in this amendment.

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16, 18-22, and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on U.S. Patent No. 5,968,119 to Stedman. Claims 5, 11, 17, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Stedman in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0038350 to Lambert et al. The rejections are traversed. Amendments to the claims are proposed to clarify the claims.

It is important to note that the Applicant's claimed invention focuses on the browser (e.g. client) side. In particular, the browser application recites a unique identifier into the address to content stored at a source (e.g. server). More particularly, the unique identifier is appended to the address as part of a query string, which can be ignored at the server side. According to the claimed invention, the manipulation of the browser cache is a client-side task, which does not involve the server.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Stedman manages browser caches from the server side. According to Stedman, the host extension (116) on the server computer (108) inserts tags when it creates an HTML document, including the tag for the unique identifier. (Stedman, col. 19, ¶ 42-61.) The server application framework then replaces those tags with a unique identifier. (i.e. at ¶ 61-64.) There apparently is no active involvement at the client side.

Lambert is cited for utilizing a timestamp as a unique identifier. Lambert appears to be otherwise unrelated to the claimed invention.

The amendments to the claims clarify that the operations are performed on the browser (e.g. client) side. Such limitations were already expressly recited in independent Claims 7 and 25. Entry of these amendments will progress the application toward issuance, and narrow the issues for appeal. Also, it is requested that the limitation "appending" and "appended" be replaced with "inserting" and "inserted" so as to not unnecessarily limit the claim scope.

Reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

OID-2001-024-01

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By  \_\_\_\_\_

Rodney D. Johnson  
Registration No. 36,558  
Telephone: (978) 341-0036  
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136  
E-mail: Rod.Johnson@hbsr.com

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated:

*May 26, 2005*